

**REMARKS**

The Official Action of January 17, 2007, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application remain claims 11-14 and 16-19, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 11-14 and 16-19 remain in the application for consideration.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his indication that claims 11-14 and 19 have been allowed.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 16-18 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph on the grounds that the term "the stop or stops" has no antecedent basis from claim 12 which does not address "stop or stops". In response, applicant has amended claim 16 to depend from claim 14 which does include the antecedent for "stop on stops".

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's 35 USC §112 rejection has now been overcome, claims 16-18 are now allowable as they are dependent from allowed claim 14, and that this application is now in condition for allowance.


Appln. No. 10/814,171  
Amdt. dated April 9, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of January 17, 2007

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently pertinent to warrant their applications against any of applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C..  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By   
Norman J. Latker  
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:nlw/ma  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BN\L\Laur\chaumat1\pto\2007-04-09 Amend-AF.doc